



Shedding Light on the Shadows: Cyberlux's Insult to Taxpayer Dollars

Description

Thirty days. That's the timeline Cyberlux Corporation has asked for—a brief window of confidentiality to keep deposition details under wraps. On the surface, this request might seem reasonable. Confidentiality agreements are a common tool in legal battles, especially in industries as sensitive as defense. Were the request from any other plaintiff or defendant, it might pass without much scrutiny, but reasonable doesn't mean righteous, and let's not pretend this is about protecting national security or trade secrets. No, this appears to be a desperate move by a company facing serious allegations about its handling of taxpayer-funded contracts.

Cyberlux's track record for transparency is about as spotless as a coal miner's boots. When Cyberlux accepted the \$78.8 million taxpayer-funded drone contract, they took on more than a lucrative deal; they assumed an obligation to the public to handle those funds responsibly and transparently. This duty to taxpayers stood alongside their pre-existing commitment under the settlement agreement to provide financial records to the plaintiffs. These dual obligations were not optional, yet Cyberlux's alleged actions—concealing the contract's termination, redirecting revenues, and avoiding disclosure—demonstrate a stunning disregard for both.

And it gets worse. Over the summer of 2024, attorneys in California, Texas, and Virginia hit Cyberlux with interrogatories—basic legal questions requiring basic answers. Instead of engaging, the company pulled its signature move: dead silence. Under legal rules, that silence speaks volumes, resulting in automatic admissions under legal rules, which the plaintiffs claim demonstrate financial mismanagement, asset shielding, and contract breaches. It's the legal equivalent of locking the vault and then loudly announcing you've done it—making the secrecy itself seem utterly pointless.

Now, let's talk about the reputational fallout, which is enough to make even the staunchest supporters squirm. Cyberlux's board of advisors includes retired generals—high-ranking officials whose careers were built on integrity and accountability. These men were paid millions in shares to lend their gravitas to Cyberlux, only to find themselves associated with a company facing significant challenges. Meanwhile, Cyberlux lobbyists have reportedly met with U.S. senators like Ted Cruz (R-TX), Thom Tillis (R-NC), Ted Budd (R-NC), John Cornyn (R-TX), and Alex Padilla (D-CA), a move that raises eyebrows about the company's efforts to influence its narrative. And let's not forget the

diehard social media advocates who continue to sing Cyberlux's praises, seemingly driven by a need to maintain the stock price level—a level critical for Cyberlux's toxic lenders to stay liquid.

But here's the kicker. This \$78.8 million contract—the one shrouded in an NDA so tight Cyberlux couldn't report its cancellation—was publicly celebrated when it was awarded. They boasted about shipments in quarterly reports, but suddenly, the truth about its termination is off-limits? This claim strains credulity. If this doesn't make your blood boil, you're clearly more Zen than I am.

As someone who's both British and American, let me say this plainly: this kind of behaviour wouldn't fly in either country. In the U.K., we'd call it dodgy. In the U.S., we'd call it disgraceful. Either way, it's an insult to the taxpayers who funded this fiasco. Whether you're an American footing the bill or a Brit watching from across the pond, it's hard not to feel outraged at the sheer audacity of it all.

The defense industry runs on trust, precision, and accountability. When a company like Cyberlux falters, it doesn't just tarnish its own reputation; it undermines confidence in the entire system. And while asking for confidentiality is technically within their rights, the optics are inescapable. At this stage, it feels less like a pragmatic legal move and more like a desperate attempt to stave off accountability. If shareholders, investors, and taxpayers can be kept in the dark about where their money went, then it's time for the government to do what it exists to do—stand up for transparency, protect the public's trust, and ensure taxpayer dollars aren't squandered in the shadows.

Disclaimer

All posts, articles, and op-eds about Cyberlux Corporation are grounded entirely in information sourced from publicly available court records, government documents, and financial disclosures filed with OTC Markets. This content is intended for informational purposes only—it's not legal advice, it's not financial guidance, and it's definitely not an invitation to dive headfirst into investment decisions. Our interpretations, opinions, and conclusions stem exclusively from these accessible resources. Ultimate adjudication of legal matters rests with the courts and qualified legal professionals. As always, you're encouraged to verify independently because, let's face it, trust but verify is a motto that never goes out of style. If you believe there is an error in our reporting and have **verifiable** proof, we encourage you to present it, and we will promptly review and address any inaccuracies.

Category

1. Cyberlux

Tags

1. contracts
2. factoring
3. FMS
4. lobbying
5. opinion
6. trump
7. U.S.
8. Ukraine

Date Created

January 22, 2025
Author
jackson